REMARK

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the current application. Claims 1-51 were pending. Claims 1-51 have been canceled without prejudice. New claims 52-72 have been added. Claims 52-72 remain pending. A Request for Continued Examination and a Petition to Revive accompany the current response.

Applicant respectfully submits that new claims 52-72 are novel and patentable over the art of record. In particular, Applicant finds it helpful to discuss new independent claim 52 with respect to the two references previously cited against claim 1, namely, U.S. Patent No. 6,526,506 (Lewis) and U.S. Patent No. 6,178,506 (Quick Jr.).

Claim 52 sets forth:

> the access point receiving a connection request from the station to initiate a setup connection between the access point and the station;
> the access point sending a shared key to the station in response to the connection request if the access point is capable of handling a connection to the station;
> the access point selecting a secret access point key subsequent to sending the shared key;
> the access point generating a self-distributed key using the secret access point key;
> the access point generating a first value using the secret access point key and a second value from the station, wherein the second value has been generated by the station using a secret station key;
> the access point sending the first value to the station, wherein the station uses the first value and the secret station key to calculate the self-distributed key;
> the access point receiving an encrypted user name and an encrypted password from the station, wherein ***the station has encrypted the user name and the password with the self-distributed key***; and
> the access point decrypting the user name and password to check for validity.

(Claim 52) (emphasis added)

In contrast, neither Lewis nor Quick Jr., alone or in combination, teaches all of the above limitation. As stated in the final Office Action, Lewis does not disclose encrypting the authentication information (Final Office Action mailed 2/17/2006, p. 9). Like Lewis,

Quick Jr. also fails to teach the access point receiving an encrypted user name and an encrypted password from the station, wherein the station has encrypted the user name and password with the self-distributed key.

According to Quick Jr., a user enters a user identifier and password into the wireless terminal (which was analogized to be the station as claimed in the final Office Action). The wireless terminal also generates a pair of Diffie-Hellman (D-H) private and public keys. The wireless terminal *uses the password entered by the user to encrypt the D-H public key*, and then *transmits the user identifier and the encrypted public key*, as a first DH-EKE message, to the base station of the serving system in a registration request. (Quick Jr., col. 4, ln. 45-58) Note that Quick Jr. does not teach encrypting the user identifier nor encrypting the password. Rather, the wireless terminal in Quick Jr. uses the password to encrypt a public key generated by the wireless terminal. Furthermore, the wireless terminal transmits the user identifier (which is *unencrypted*) and the encrypted public key (*not* the password) to the serving station. Therefore, Quick Jr. fails to teach the limitation of "the access point receiving an encrypted user name and an encrypted password from the station, wherein the station has encrypted the user name and the password with the self-distributed key" set forth in claim 52.

Because neither Lewis nor Quick Jr., alone or in combination, teaches all limitations set forth in claim 52, claim 52 is patentable over Lewis in view of Quick Jr. for at least this reason. Allowance of claim 52 is earnestly solicited.

For at least the reason discussed above with respect to claim 52, claims 56, 61, 65, and 70 are patentable over Lewis in view of Quick Jr. Claims 53-55, 57-60, 62-64, 66-69, and 71-72 depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 52, 56, 61, 65, and 70,

respectively, and thus, are patentable over Lewis in view of Quick Jr. Allowance of claims 53-72 is earnestly solicited.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that new claims 52-72 are novel and patentable over the art of record. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (408) 720-8300.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(3), Applicants hereby request and authorize the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office to (1) treat any concurrent or future reply that requires a petition for extension of time as incorporating a petition for extension of time for the appropriate length of time and (2) charge all required fees, including extension of time fees and fees under 37 C.F.R. 1.16 and 1.17, to Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 4/14/08

Chui-kiu Teresa Wong
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 48,042

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040
Phone (408) 720-8300
Fax (408) 720-8383